arXiv:1510.01459v2 [math.PR] 8 Apr 2016

HÖLDERIAN WEAK INVARIANCE PRINCIPLE UNDER MAXWELL AND WOODROOFE CONDITION

DAVIDE GIRAUDO

Abstract. We investigate the weak invariance principle in Hölder spaces under some reinforcement of the Maxwell and Woodroofe condition.

1. Introduction and main results

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space and let $T\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ be a measure-preserving bijective and bi-measurable map. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{F}$ such that $T\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}$. If $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ a measurable function, we denote $S_n(T,f) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^j$ and

$$W(n,f,T,t) := S_{[nt]}(T,f) + (nt - [nt]) f \circ T^{[nt]}. \tag{1.1}$$

We shall write $S_n(f)$ and $W(n,f,t)$ for simplicity, except when T is replaced by T^2.

An important problem in probability theory is the understanding of the asymptotic behavior of the process $(n^{-1/2}W(n,f,t), t \in [0,1])_{n\geqslant 1}$. Conditions on the quantities $\mathbb{E}[S_n(f) \mid T\mathcal{M}]$ and $S_n(f) - \mathbb{E}[S_n(f) \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{M}]$ have been investigated. The first result in this direction was obtained by Maxwell and Woodroofe [MW00]: if f is $\mathcal{M}$-measurable and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\right]\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < +\infty, \tag{1.2}$$

then $(n^{-1/2}S_n(f))_{n\geqslant 1}$ converges in distribution to $\eta^2 N$, where N is normally distributed and independent of η. Then Volný [Vol06] proposed a method to treat the nonadapted case. Peligrad and Utev [PU05] proved the weak invariance principle under condition (1.2). The nonadapted case was addressed in [Vol07]. Peligrad and Utev also showed that condition (1.2) is optimal among conditions on the growth of the sequence $(\|S_n(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\|_2)_{n\geqslant 1}$: if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} a_n \frac{\|\mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\right]\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty \tag{1.3}$$

for some sequence $(a_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ converging to 0, the sequence $(n^{-1/2}S_n(f))_{n\geqslant 1}$ is not necessarily stochastically bounded (Theorem 1.2. of [PU05]). Volný constructed [Vol10] an example satisfying (1.3) and such that the sequence $\left(\|S_n(f)\|_2^{-1} S_n(f)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$ admits two subsequences which converge weakly to two different distributions.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$ the space of Hölder continuous functions, that is, the functions $x\colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}_\alpha} := \sup_{0\leqslant s<t\leqslant 1} |x(t) - x(s)| / (t-s)^\alpha + |x(0)|$ is finite. Since

Date: April 11, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F05; 60F17.

Key words and phrases. Invariance principle, martingales, Hölder spaces, strictly stationary process.

the paths of Brownian motion belong almost surely to $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in (0,1/2)$ as well as $W(n,f,\cdot)$, we can investigate the weak convergence of the sequence $(n^{-1/2}W(n,f,\cdot))_{n\geqslant 1}$ in the the space $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$, for $0<\alpha<1/2$. The case of i.i.d. sequences and stationary martingale difference sequences have been addressed respectively by Račkauskas and Suquet (Theorem 1 of [RS03]) and Giraudo (Theorem 2.2 of [Gir16b]). In this note, we focus on conditions on the sequences $(\mathbb{E}[S_n(f) \mid \mathcal{M}])_{n\geqslant 1}$ and $(S_n(f)-\mathbb{E}[S_n(f) \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{M}])_{n\geqslant 1}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $p>2$ and $f\in\mathbb{L}^p$. If*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty}\frac{\|\mathbb{E}[S_k(f)\mid\mathcal{M}\|_p}{k^{3/2}}<+\infty,\quad \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty}\frac{\left\|S_k(f)-\mathbb{E}[S_k(f)\mid T^{-k}\mathcal{M}\right\|_p}{k^{3/2}}<+\infty, \tag{1.4}$$

then the sequence $\left(n^{-1/2}W(n,f)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$ converges weakly to the process $\sqrt{\eta}W$ in $\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}$, where W is the Brownian motion and the random variable η is independent of W and is given by $\eta=\lim_{n\to+\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f)^2\mid\mathcal{I}\right]$ (where $\mathcal{I}$ is the σ-algebra of invariant sets and the limit is in the $\mathbb{L}^1$ sense).

Of course, if f is $\mathcal{M}$-measurable, all the terms of the second series vanish and we only have to check the convergence of the first series.

Remark 1.2. If the sequence $(f\circ T^j)_{j\geqslant 0}$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to the filtration $(T^{-i}\mathcal{M})$, then condition (1.4) is satisfied if and only if the function f belongs to $\mathbb{L}^p$, hence we recover the result of [Gir16b]. However, if the sequence $(f\circ T^j)_{j\geqslant 0}$ is independent, (1.4) is stronger than the sufficient condition $t^p\mu\{|f|>t\}\to 0$. This can be explained by the fact that the key maximal inequality (2.9) does not include the quadratic variance term which appears in the martingale inequality. In Remark 1 (after the proof of Theorem 1) in [PUW07], a version of (2.9) with this term is obtained. In our context it seems that it does not follow from an adaptation of the proof.

Remark 1.3. In [Gir16b], the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 was obtained for an $\mathcal{M}$-measurable f under the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid T^i\mathcal{M}\right]-\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid T^{i+1}\mathcal{M}\right]\right\|_p<\infty, \tag{1.5}$$

which holds as soon as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty}\frac{\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[f\circ T^k\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\right\|_p}{k^{1/p}}<+\infty, \tag{1.6}$$

while (1.4) holds as soon as

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty}\frac{\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[f\circ T^k\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\right\|_p}{\sqrt{k}}<+\infty. \tag{1.7}$$

Therefore, (1.7) gives a better sufficient condition than (1.6) if we seek for conditions relying only of $\left(\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[f\circ T^k\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\right\|_p\right)_{k\geqslant 1}$.

However, (1.5) gives the existence of of a martingale approximation in the following sense: there exists a martingale difference $m\in\mathbb{L}^p(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$\Big\|\|W(n,f)-W(n,m)\|_{\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}}\Big\|_{p,\infty}=o(\sqrt{n}). \tag{1.8}$$

In order to get a martingale approximation in the sense of (1.8) under a Maxwell and Woodroofe type condition, one needs the condition

$$\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{\|\mathbb{E}[S_k(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\|_p}{k^{1+1/p}} < +\infty \tag{1.9}$$

(see Theorem 2.3 of [CM14] for the construction of the approximating martingale).

Furthermore, using the contruction given in [DV08,Dur09], in any ergodic dynamical system of positive entropy one can construct a function satisfying condition (1.4) but not (1.5) and vice versa.

Remark 1.4. For the ρ-mixing coefficient defined by

$$\rho(n) = \sup\left\{\mathrm{Cov}(X,Y)/(\|X\|_2\,\|Y\|_2), X \in \mathbb{L}^2(\sigma(f\circ T^i, i\leqslant 0), Y \in \mathbb{L}^2(\sigma(f\circ T^i, i\geqslant n))\right\},$$

Lemma 1 of [PUW07] shows that for an adapted process, condition (1.4) is satisfied if the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\rho^{2/p}(2^n)$ converges. However, the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds if $t^p\mu\{|f|>t\}\to 0$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\rho(2^n)$ converges (see Theorem 2.3, [Gir16a]), which is less restrictive.

It turns out that even in the adapted case, condition (1.4) is sharp among conditions on $\|\mathbb{E}[S_k(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\|_p$ in the following sense.

Theorem 1.5. *For each sequence $(a_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ converging to 0 and each real number $p>2$, there exists a strictly stationary sequence $(f\circ T^j)_{j\geqslant 0}$ and a sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ such that $T\mathcal{M}\subset\mathcal{M}$,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a_n}{n^{3/2}}\|\mathbb{E}[S_n(f)\mid\mathcal{M}]\|_p<\infty, \tag{1.10}$$

but the sequence $\left(n^{-1/2}W(n,f,t)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is not tight in $\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}$.

Remark 1.6. Using the inequalities in [PUW07] in order to bound $\|\mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f)\mid T\mathcal{M}\right]\|_2$, we can see that the constructed f in the proof of Theorem 1.5 satisfies the classical Maxwell and Woodroofe condition (1.2) (the fact that p is strictly greater than 2 is crucial), hence the weak invariance principle in the space of continuous functions takes place.

However, it remains an open question whether condition (1.10) implies the central limit theorem or the weak invariance principle (in the space of continuous functions).

2. Proofs

We may observe that condition (1.4) implies by Theorem 1 of [PUW07] that the sequence $(S_n(f)/\sqrt{n})_{n\geqslant 1}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{L}^p$; nevertheless the counter-example given in Theorem 2.6 of [Gir16a] shows that we cannot deduce the weak invariance principle from this.

We shall rather work with a tighness criterion. The analogue of the continuity modulus in $C[0,1]$ is ω_α, defined by

$$\omega_\alpha(x,\delta)=\sup_{0<|t-s|<\delta}\frac{|x(t)-x(s)|}{|t-s|^\alpha},\quad x\colon[0,1]\to\mathbb{R},\delta\in(0,].$$

We then define $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$ by $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]:=\{x\in\mathcal{H}_\alpha[0,1],\lim_{\delta\to 0}\omega_\alpha(x,\delta)=0\}$. We shall essentially work with the space $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$ which, endowed with $\|\cdot\|_\alpha : x\mapsto\omega_\alpha(x,1)+|x(0)|$, is a separable

Banach space (while $\mathcal{H}_\alpha[0,1]$ is not). Since the canonical embedding $\iota\colon \mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1] \to \mathcal{H}_\alpha[0,1]$ is continuous, each convergence in distribution in $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$ also takes place in $\mathcal{H}_\alpha[0,1]$.

Let us state the tighness criterion we shall use (Theorem 13 of [Suq99]).

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$. A sequence of processes $(\xi_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ with paths in $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$ and such that $\xi_n(0)=0$ for each n is tight in $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$ if and only if*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{n\to+\infty} \mu\left\{\omega_\alpha(\xi_n,\delta) > \varepsilon\right\} = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

In order to prove the weak convergence in $\mathcal{H}^o_\alpha[0,1]$, it suffices to prove the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions and establish tighness in this space.

2.1. **A maximal inequality.** For $p>2$, we define

$$\|h\|_{p,\infty} := \sup_{\substack{A\in\mathcal{F}\\ \mu(A)>0}} \frac{1}{\mu(A)^{1-1/p}} \mathbb{E}[|h|\,\mathbf{1}_A]. \tag{2.2}$$

This norm is linked to the tail function of h by the following inequalities (see Exercice 1.1.12 p. 13 in [Gra14]):

$$\left(\sup_{t>0} t^p \mu\left\{|h|>t\right\}\right)^{1/p} \leqslant \|h\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant \frac{p}{p-1}\left(\sup_{t>0} t^p \mu\left\{|h|>t\right\}\right)^{1/p}. \tag{2.3}$$

As a consequence, if N is an integer and $h_1,\dots,h_n$ are functions, then

$$\left\| \max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant N} |h_j| \right\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant \frac{p}{p-1} N^{1/p} \max_{1\leqslant j\leqslant N} \left\| |h_j| \right\|_{p,\infty}. \tag{2.4}$$

For a positive $n\geqslant 1$, a function $f\colon \Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ and a measure-preserving map T, we define

$$M(n,f,T) := \max_{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{|S_j(T,f)-S_i(T,f)|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}}. \tag{2.5}$$

By Lemma A.2 of [MSR12], the Hölderian norm of a polygonal line is reached at two vertices, hence

$$M(n,f,T) = n^{1/2-1/p} \left\|W(n,f,T,\cdot)\right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}} \tag{2.6}$$

Applying Proposition 2.3 of [Gir16b], we can find for each $p>2$ a constant C_p depending only on p such that if $(m\circ T^i)_{i\geqslant 1}$ is a martingale difference sequence, then for each n,

$$\|M(n,m,T)\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant C_p n^{1/p} \|m\|_p. \tag{2.7}$$

In the sequel, fix such a constant C_p. We denote U the Koopman operator, that is, for each $f\colon\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ and each $\omega\in\Omega$, $(Uf)(\omega)=f(T\omega)$.

Definition 2.2. *Let H be a subspace of $\mathbb{L}^p$ such that $UH\subset H$. Let $(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}$ be a semi-group of operators from H to itself. We say that $\left(T,(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfies condition (C) if*

(1) for each $k\geqslant 1$, $P_{T^k}=P_T^k$;

(2) P_T is power bounded on H, that is, for each $h\in H$,

$$K(P_T) := \sup_{n\geqslant 1} \sup_{h\in H\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\|P_T^n h\|_p}{\|h\|_p} < +\infty; \tag{2.8}$$

(3) if $h\in H$ is such that $P_T h=0$, then the sequence $(h\circ T^i)_{i\geqslant 0}$ is a martingale difference sequence with respect to the filtration $(T^{-i}\mathcal{M})_{i\geqslant 0}$ or $(T^{-i-1}\mathcal{M})_{i\geqslant 0}$;

(4) $P_T U^{-1} f = f$ *for each* $f \in H$ *or* $P_T U f = f$ *for each* $f \in H$.

The goal of this subsection is to establish the following maximal inequality.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* H *be a subspace of* $\mathbb{L}^p$ *such that* $UH \subset H$. *Let* r *be a positive integer. For each measure-preserving map* $T\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ *bijective and bi-measurable, each semi-group of operators from* H *to itself* $(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}$ *such that* $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ *satisfies condition* (C) *with* $P_T U^{-1} = \mathrm{Id}$, *each* $f \in H$ *and each integer* n *satisfying* $2^{r-1} \leqslant n < 2^r$,

$$\|M(n,f,T)\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant C_p n^{1/p} \left(\left\| f - U^{\pm} P_T f \right\|_p + K_p \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} 2^{-j/2} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1} P_T^i f \right\|_p \right), \tag{2.9}$$

where $K_p = 2^{1/p-1/2} + 2^{1/2}\left(2 + K(P_T)\right)$, $U^{\pm} = U^{-1}$ *if* $P_T U^{-1} = \mathrm{Id}$ *and* $U^{\pm} = U$ *if* $P_T U = \mathrm{Id}$.

If H is a subspace of $\mathbb{L}^p$ such that $UH \subset H$, $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfying condition (C) and $f \in H$, we define

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)} := \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} 2^{-j/2} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1} P_T^i f \right\|_p \tag{2.10}$$

and the vector space

$$\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T) := \left\{ f \in H \mid \|f\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)} < +\infty \right\}. \tag{2.11}$$

Combining Proposition 2.3 and (2.6), we derive the following bound for the Hölderian norm of the partial sum process.

Corollary 2.4. *Let* H *be a subspace of* $\mathbb{L}^p$ *such that* $UH \subset H$. *If* $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ *satisfies condition* (C), *then there exists a constant* $C = C(p, P_T)$ *such that for each* n, *and each* $h \in H$,

$$\left\| \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} W(n,h) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}} \right\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant C \|h\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)} \tag{2.12}$$

The proof of Proposition 2.3 is in the same spirit as the proof of Theorem 1 of [PUW07], which is done by dyadic induction. To do so, we start from the following lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *For each positive integer* n, *each function* $h\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ *and each measure-preserving map* $T\colon \Omega \to \Omega$, *the following inequality holds:*

$$M(n,h,T) \leqslant 6 \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left| h \circ T^k \right| + \frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}} M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2} \right], h + h\circ T, T^2 \right). \tag{2.13}$$

Proof. First, notice that if $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$, then $j = 2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]$ or $j = 2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right] + 1$, hence

$$\left| S_j(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) \right| \leqslant \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left| h \circ T^k \right|. \tag{2.14}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left| S_i(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h) \right| \leqslant 2 \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left| h \circ T^k \right|. \tag{2.15}$$

It thus follows that

$$M(n,h,T) \leqslant 4 \max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left| h \circ T^k \right| + \max_{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{\left| S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h) \right|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}}. \tag{2.16}$$

Notice that if $j \geqslant i+4$, then

$$1 \leqslant \left[\frac{j}{2}\right] - \left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right] \leqslant \frac{j-i}{2}, \tag{2.17}$$

and we derive the bound

$$\max_{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{\left|S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h)\right|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}} \max_{0\leqslant u<v\leqslant\left[\frac{n}{2}\right]} \frac{\left|S_v(T^2, h+h\circ T) - S_u(T^2, h+h\circ T)\right|}{(v-u)^{1/2-1/p}} + \\ + \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant n\\ j\leqslant i+4}} \left|S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h)\right|.$$

Since for $j \leqslant i+4$, the number of terms of the form $h\circ T^q$ involved in $S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h)$ is at most 2, we conclude that

$$\max_{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{\left|S_{2\left[\frac{j}{2}\right]}(h) - S_{2\left[\frac{i+2}{2}\right]}(h)\right|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \leqslant \frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}} M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right], h+h\circ T, T^2\right) + \\ + 2\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left|h\circ T^k\right|.$$

Combining this inequality with (2.16), we obtain (2.13), which concludes the proof of Lemma 2.5. □

Now, we establish inequality (2.9) by induction on r.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. We first assume that $P_T U^{-1} = \mathrm{Id}$. We check the case $r = 1$. Then necessarily $n = 1$ and the expression $M(n, f, t)$ reduces to f. Since C_p and K_p are greater than 1, the result is a simple consequence of the triangle inequality applied to $f - U^{-1}P_T f$ and $U^{-1}P_T f$.

Now, assume that Proposition 2.3 holds for some r and let us show that it takes place for $r+1$. We thus consider an integer n such that $2^r \leqslant n < 2^{r+1}$, a function $f \in H$, a measure-preserving map $T\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ bijective and bi-measurable, and a sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying $T\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}$, and $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfying condition (C) with $P_T U^{-1} = \mathrm{Id}$ and we have to show that (2.9) holds with $r+1$ instead of r. First, using inequality $M(n, f) \leqslant M(n, f - U^{-1}P_T f) + M(n, U^{-1}P_T f)$ and Lemma 2.5 with $h := U^{-1}P_T f$, we derive

$$M(n, f, T) \leqslant M\left(n, f - U^{-1}P_T f, T\right) + 6\max_{0\leqslant k\leqslant n} \left|U^{-1}P_T f\circ T^k\right| + \\ + \frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}} M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right], (I+U)U^{-1}P_T f, T^2\right), \tag{2.18}$$

hence taking the norm $\|\cdot\|_{p,\infty}$, we obtain by (2.4) that

$$\|M(n, f, T)\|_{p,\infty} \leqslant \left\|M(n, f - U^{-1}P_T f, T)\right\|_{p,\infty} + 6(n+1)^{1/p}\frac{p}{p-1}\left\|U^{-1}P_T f\right\|_p + \\ + \frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}}\left\|M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right], (I+U)U^{-1}P_T f, T^2\right)\right\|_{p,\infty}. \tag{2.19}$$

By inequality (2.7) and accounting the fact that $6\cdot(n+1)^{1/p}p/(p-1)\leqslant C_p n^{1/p}$, we obtain

$$\|M(n,f,T)\|_{p,\infty}\leqslant C_p n^{1/p}\left\|f-U^{-1}P_Tf\right\|_p+C_pn^{1/p}\|P_Tf\|_p+\\+\frac{1}{2^{1/2-1/p}}\left\|M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right],(I+U)U^{-1}P_Tf,T^2\right)\right\|_{p,\infty}. \quad (2.20)$$

Since $2^{r-1}\leqslant[n/2]<2^r$, we may apply the induction hypothesis to the integer $[n/2]$, the function $h:=(I+U^{-1})P_Tf$, $\left(T,(P_{T^{2k}})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ instead of $\left(T,(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$. This gives

$$\left[\frac{n}{2}\right]^{-1/p}\left\|M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right],h,T^2\right)\right\|_{p,\infty}\leqslant C_p\left\|h-U^{-2}P_{T^2}h\right\|_p+\\+C_pK_p\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}2^{-j/2}\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1}P_{T^2}(I+U^{-1}f)\right\|_p. \quad (2.21)$$

Notice that $\left\|h-U^{-2}P_{T^2}h\right\|_p\leqslant(2+K(P_T))\|h\|_p\leqslant 2(2+K(P_T))\|P_Tf\|_p$, and by items 1 and 4 of Definition 2.2, it follows that $\sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1}P_{T^2}(I+U^{-1}f)=\sum_{i=0}^{2^{j+1}-1}P_T^if$. Accounting the inequality $K\left(P_T^2\right)\leqslant K\left(P_T\right)$, we have

$$\left[\frac{n}{2}\right]^{-1/p}\left\|M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right],h,T^2\right)\right\|_{p,\infty}\leqslant 2(2+K(P_T))C_p\|P_Tf\|_p+C_pK_p\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}2^{-j/2}\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{2^{j+1}-1}P_T^if\right\|_p\\=2(2+K(P_T))C_p\|P_Tf\|_p+2^{1/2}C_pK_p\sum_{j=1}^{r}2^{-j/2}\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1}P_T^if\right\|_p$$

and we infer

$$\left\|M\left(\left[\frac{n}{2}\right],h,T^2\right)\right\|_{p,\infty}\leqslant\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1/p}\left(2(2+K(P_T))-K_p\sqrt{2}\right)C_p\|P_Tf\|_p\\+n^{1/p}2^{1/2-1/p}C_pK_p\sum_{j=0}^{r}2^{-j/2}\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1}P_T^if\right\|_p. \quad (2.22)$$

Pluggling this into (2.20), we derive

$$\|M(n,f,T)\|_{p,\infty}\leqslant C_pn^{1/p}\left\|f-U^{-1}P_Tf\right\|_p+n^{1/p}C_pK_p\sum_{j=0}^{r}2^{-j/2}\left\|\sum_{i=0}^{2^j-1}P_T^if\right\|_p+\\+C_pn^{1/p}\left(1+2^{1-1/p}(2+K(P_T))-2^{1/2-1/p}K_p\right)\|P_Tf\|_p. \quad (2.23)$$

The definition of K_p implies that $2^{1/p-1/2}-\sqrt{2}(2+K(P_T))-K_p=0$, hence (2.9) is established. This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.3 in the case $P_TU^{-1}=\mathrm{Id}$.

When $P_TU=\mathrm{Id}$ we do the same proof, but replacing each occurrence of U^{-1} by U. This ends the proof of Proposition 2.3. □

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Since the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions is contained in the main result of [PU05], the only difficulty in proving Theorem 1.1 is to establish tightness. To this aim, we shall proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5.3 in [Cun14].

Proposition 2.6. *Let T be a measure preserving map, H a subspace of $\mathbb{L}^p$ ($p>2$) such that $UH \subset H$ and let $(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}$ be a family of operators from H to itself such that $\left(T,(P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfies condition (C). Assume that h is an element of H such that $\|h\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}<+\infty$*

Then the sequence $(n^{-1/2}W(n,h))_{n\geqslant 1}$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}$.

Proof. Let us define $V_n:=\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}P_T^i$. Using $\|V_nV_k\|_p\leqslant K(P_T)\min\left\{k\|V_n\|_p\,,n\|V_k\|_p\right\}$, we derive that for each $f\in\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$,

$$\frac{\|V_{2^n}f\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}}{2^n}\leqslant K(P_T)\left(\frac{\|V_{2^n}f\|_p}{2^{n/2}}+\sum_{k\geqslant n+1}\frac{\left\|V^{2^k}f\right\|_p}{2^{k/2}}\right) \tag{2.24}$$

which goes to 0 as n goes to infinity. If $m\geqslant 1$ is an integer and if n is such that $2^n\leqslant m<2^{n+1}$, then

$$\frac{\|V_mf\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}}{m}\leqslant\frac{K(P_T)}{m}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\|V_{2^k}f\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}\leqslant\frac{K(P_T)}{m}\sum_{k=0}^{n}2^k\varepsilon_k, \tag{2.25}$$

where $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ is a sequence converging to 0. This entails that the operator P_T is mean-ergodic on $\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$. Furthermore, since P_T has no non trivial fixed points on the Banach space $(\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T),\cdot)$, we derive by Theorem 1.3 p.73 of [Kre85] that the subspace $(I-P_T)\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$ is dense in $\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$ for the topology induced by the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}$.

Let $h\in H$ be such that $\|h\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}<+\infty$ and $x>0$. We can find $f\in(I-P_T)\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$ such that $\|h-f\|_{\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)}<x$. Consequently, using Corollary 2.4, we derive that for each positive ε and δ,

$$\mu\left\{\omega_{1/2-1/p}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}W(n,h),\delta\right)>2\varepsilon\right\}\leqslant\varepsilon^{-p}x+\mu\left\{\omega_{1/2-1/p}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}W(n,f),\delta\right)>\varepsilon\right\}. \tag{2.26}$$

Now, since the function f belongs to $(I-P_T)\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$, we can find $f'\in\mathrm{MW}(p,P_T)$ such that $f=f'-P_Tf'$. If $P_TU^{-1}=\mathrm{Id}$, then we have $f=f'-U^{-1}P_Tf'+(U^{-1}-I)f'$ and if $P_TU=\mathrm{Id}$, then $f=f'-UP_Tf'+(U-I)f'$. In other words, f admits a martingale-coboundary decomposition in $\mathbb{L}^p$ (since f' belongs to $\mathbb{L}^p$). Consequently, by Corollary 2.5 of [Gir16b], the sequence $(n^{-1/2}W(n,f))_{n\geqslant 1}$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}_{1/2-1/p}$. By Proposition 2.1 and (2.26), we derive that for each positive ε and x,

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\mu\left\{\omega_{1/2-1/p}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}W(n,h),\delta\right)>2\varepsilon\right\}\leqslant\varepsilon^{-p}x. \tag{2.27}$$

Since x is arbitrary we conclude the proof of (2.6) by using again Proposition 2.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Writing $f=\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid\mathcal{M}\right]+f-\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid\mathcal{M}\right]$, the proof reduces (as mentioned in the begining of the section) to establish tightness in $\mathcal{H}^o_{1/2-1/p}[0,1]$ of the sequences $(W_n)_{n\geqslant 1}:=\left(n^{-1/2}W\left(n,\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\right)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$ and $(W'_n)_{n\geqslant 1}:=\left(n^{-1/2}W\left(n,f-\mathbb{E}\left[f\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\right)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$.

- Tightness of $(W_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$. We define

$$P_T(f):=\mathbb{E}\left[Uf\mid\mathcal{M}\right]\text{ and }H:=\left\{f\in\mathbb{L}^p,f\text{ is }\mathcal{M}\text{-measurable}\right\}. \tag{2.28}$$

Then $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfies condition (C). Since

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} P_T^i \left(\mathbb{E}\left[f \mid \mathcal{M}\right]\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f) \mid \mathcal{M}\right], \tag{2.29}$$

the convergence of the first series in (1.4) is equivalent to $f \in \mathrm{MW}(p, P_T)$ (by Lemma 2.7 of [PU05]). By Proposition 2.6, we derive that the sequence $(W_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^o_{1/2-1/p}[0,1]$.

- Tightness of $(W'_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$. We define

$$P_T(f) := U^{-1}f - \mathbb{E}\left[U^{-1}f \mid \mathcal{M}\right] \text{ and } H := \{f \in \mathbb{L}^p, \mathbb{E}\left[f \mid \mathcal{M}\right] = 0\}. \tag{2.30}$$

Since for each $f \in H$ and each $k \geqslant 1$, $\left\|P_T^k f\right\|_p \leqslant 2\left\|f\right\|_p$, $\left(T, (P_{T^k})_{k\geqslant 1}\right)$ satisfies condition (C) (see the proof of Proposition 2 in [Vol07] for the other conditions). Since $P_T\left(\mathbb{E}\left[f \mid \mathcal{M}\right]\right) = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_T^i \left(f - \mathbb{E}\left[f \mid \mathcal{M}\right]\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_T^i f = U^{-n}\left(S_n(f) - \mathbb{E}\left[S_n(f) \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{M}\right]\right), \tag{2.31}$$

hence the convergence of the second series in (1.4) implies that f belongs to $\mathrm{MW}(p, P_T)$ (by Lemma 37 of [MP13]). By Proposition 2.6, we derive that the sequence $(W'_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is tight in $\mathcal{H}^o_{1/2-1/p}[0,1]$.

This ends the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** We take a similar construction as in the proof of Proposition 1 of [PUW07]. We consider a non-negative sequence $(a_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$, and a sequence $(u_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ of real numbers such that

$$u_1 = 1, u_2 = 2, u_k^{p/2+1} + 1 < u_{k+1} \text{ for } k \geqslant 3 \text{ and } a_t \leqslant k^{-2} \text{ for } t \geqslant u_k. \tag{2.32}$$

Notice that since $p > 2$, the conditions (2.32) are more restrictive than that of the proof of Proposition 1 of [PUW07]. If $i = u_j$ for some $j \geqslant 1$, then we define $p_i := cj/u_j^{1+p/2}$ and $p_i = 0$ otherwise. Let $(Y_k)_{k\geqslant 0}$ be a discrete time Markov chain with the state space $\mathbb{Z}^+$ and transition matrix given by $p_{k,k-1} = 1$ for $k \geqslant 1$ and $p_{0,j-1} := p_j$, $j \geqslant 1$. We shall also consider a random variable τ which takes its values among non-negative integers, and whose distribution is given by $\mu(\tau = j) = p_j$. Then the stationary distribution exists and is given by

$$\pi_j = \pi_0 \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} p_i, j \geqslant 1, \text{ where } \pi_0 = 1/\mathbb{E}[\tau]. \tag{2.33}$$

We start from the stationary distribution $(\pi_j)_{j\geqslant 0}$ and we take $g(x) := \mathbf{1}_{x=0} - \pi_0$, where $\pi_0 = \mu\{Y_0 = 0\}$. We then define $f \circ T^j = X_j := g(Y_j)$.

It is already checked in [PUW07] that the sequence $(X_j)_{j\geqslant 0}$ satisfies (1.10), where $\mathcal{M} = \sigma(X_k, k \leqslant j)$ and $S_n = \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$. To conclude the proof, it remains to check that the sequence $\left(n^{-1/2}W(n, f, T)\right)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is not tight in $\mathcal{H}^o_{1/2-1/p}$, which will be done by disproving (2.1) for a particular choice of ε. To this aim, we define

$$T_0 = 0, T_k = \min\{t > T_{k-1} \mid Y_t = 0\}, \quad \tau_k = T_k - T_{k-1}, k \geqslant 1. \tag{2.34}$$

Then $(\tau_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ is an independent sequence and each τ_k is distributed as τ and

$$S_{T_k} = \sum_{j=1}^{k}(1-\pi_0\tau_j) = k - \pi_0 T_k. \tag{2.35}$$

Let us fix some integer K greater than $\mathbb{E}[\tau]$. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ be fixed and n an integer such that $1/n < \delta$. Then the inequality

$$\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK\\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant \frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \mathbf{1}\left\{T_n \leqslant Kn\right\} \times \\ \times \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n} \frac{\left|S_{T_k} - S_{T_{k-1}}\right|}{(T_k - T_{k-1})^{1/2-1/p}} \mathbf{1}\left\{|T_k - T_{k-1}| \leqslant n\delta\right\} \tag{2.36}$$

takes place. By (2.34) and (2.35), this can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK\\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant \frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \mathbf{1}\left\{T_n \leqslant Kn\right\} \times \\ \times \max_{1\leqslant k\leqslant n} \frac{|1-\pi_0\tau_k|}{\tau_k^{1/2-1/p}} \mathbf{1}\left\{\tau_k \leqslant n\delta\right\}. \tag{2.37}$$

Defining for a fixed C the event

$$A_n(C) := \left\{\frac{|1-\pi_0\tau|}{\tau^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant C(Kn)^{1/p}\right\} \cap \left\{\tau \leqslant n\delta\right\}, \tag{2.38}$$

we obtain by independence of $(\tau_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$

$$\mu\left\{\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK\\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant C\right\} \geqslant 1 - (1-\mu(A_n(C)))^n - \mu\left\{T_n > Kn\right\}. \tag{2.39}$$

By the law of large numbers, we obtain, accounting $K > \mathbb{E}[\tau]$, that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mu\left\{\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK\\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant C\right\} \geqslant \limsup_{n\to\infty} 1 - (1-\mu(A_n(C)))^n. \tag{2.40}$$

We choose $C := \pi_0/(2K^{1/p})$. Considering the integers n of the form $\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]$, we obtain in view of (2.40) :

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mu\left\{\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK\\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant \frac{\pi_0}{2K^{1/p}}\right\} \geqslant \\ \geqslant \limsup_{j\to\infty} 1 - \left(1 - \mu\left(A_{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]}\left(\frac{\pi_0}{2K^{1/p}}\right)\right)\right)^{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]}. \tag{2.41}$$

Since $\tau \geqslant 1$ almost surely, the following inclusions take place for $n > (2/\pi_0)^p$:

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(\pi_0/(2K^{1/p})) &\supset \left\{\pi_0\tau^{1/2+1/p} - \tau^{-1/2+1/p} \geqslant \pi_0/(2K^{1/p})(Kn)^{1/p}\right\} \cap \{\tau \leqslant n\delta\} \\ &\supset \left\{\tau^{1/2+1/p} \geqslant \frac{1+\pi_0 n^{1/p}/2}{\pi_0}\right\} \cap \{\tau \leqslant n\delta\} \\ &\supset \left\{\tau^{1/2+1/p} \geqslant n^{1/p}\right\} \cap \{\tau \leqslant n\delta\} \\ &= \left\{n^{2/(p+2)} \leqslant \tau \leqslant n\delta\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for j large enough,

$$\mu\left(A_{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]}\left(\frac{\pi_0}{2K^{1/p}}\right)\right) \geqslant \mu\left\{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]^{2/(p+2)} \leqslant \tau \leqslant \left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]\delta\right\}. \tag{2.42}$$

Since τ takes only integer values among u_l's and $\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]\delta < u_{j+1}$ (by (2.32) and the fact that $\delta < 1$), we obtain in view of (2.41), that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mu\left\{\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK \\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \geqslant \frac{\pi_0}{2K^{1/p}}\right\} \geqslant \\ \geqslant \limsup_{j\to\infty} 1 - (1-\mu\{\tau = u_j\})^{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]} \\ = 1 - \liminf_{j\to\infty}\left(1 - cju_j^{-1-p/2}\right)^{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Noticing that for a fixed J,

$$\liminf_{j\to\infty}\left(1 - cju_j^{-1-p/2}\right)^{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]} \leqslant \limsup_{j\to\infty}\left(1 - cJu_j^{-1-p/2}\right)^{\left[u_j^{(p+2)/2}\right]} = e^{-cJ}, \tag{2.44}$$

we deduce that the last term of (2.43) is equal to 1. Since

$$\frac{1}{(nK)^{1/p}} \max_{\substack{0\leqslant i<j\leqslant nK \\ j-i\leqslant n\delta}} \frac{|S_j - S_i|}{(j-i)^{1/2-1/p}} \leqslant \omega_{1/2-1/p}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK}} W(nK, f), \delta\right), \tag{2.45}$$

we derive that (2.1) does not hold with $\varepsilon = \pi_0/(2K^{1/p})$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Acknowledgements The author would like to thank an anonymous referee for many valuable comments which improved the presentation of the paper and led to a shorter proof of Theorem 1.1.

References

[CM14] Christophe Cuny and Florence Merlevède, *On martingale approximations and the quenched weak invariance principle*, Ann. Probab. **42** (2014), no. 2, 760–793. MR 3178473 3

[Cun14] Christophe Cuny, *Limit theorems under the Maxwell-Woodroofe condition in Banach spaces*, 2014. 8

[Dur09] Olivier Durieu, *Independence of four projective criteria for the weak invariance principle*, ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. **5** (2009), 21–26. MR 2475604 (2010c:60109) 3

[DV08] Olivier Durieu and Dalibor Volný, *Comparison between criteria leading to the weak invariance principle*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. **44** (2008), no. 2, 324–340. MR 2446326 (2010a:60075) 3

[Gir16a] Davide Giraudo, *Holderian weak invariance principle for stationary mixing sequences*, 2016, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01075583, to appear in Journal of Theoretical Probability. 3

[Gir16b] Davide Giraudo, *Holderian weak invariance principle under a Hannan type condition*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **126** (2016), no. 1, 290–311. MR 3426520 2, 4, 8

[Gra14] Loukas Grafakos, *Classical Fourier analysis*, third ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 249, Springer, New York, 2014. MR 3243734 4

[Kre85] Ulrich Krengel, *Ergodic theorems*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 6, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1985, With a supplement by Antoine Brunel. MR 797411 8

[MP13] Florence Merlevède and Magda Peligrad, *Rosenthal-type inequalities for the maximum of partial sums of stationary processes and examples*, Ann. Probab. **41** (2013), no. 2, 914–960. MR 3077530 9

[MSR12] Jurgita Markevičiūtė, Charles Suquet, and Alfredas Račkauskas, *Functional central limit theorems for sums of nearly nonstationary processes*, Lith. Math. J. **52** (2012), no. 3, 282–296. MR 3020943 4

[MW00] Michael Maxwell and Michael Woodroofe, *Central limit theorems for additive functionals of Markov chains*, Ann. Probab. **28** (2000), no. 2, 713–724. MR 1782272 (2001g:60164) 1

[PU05] Magda Peligrad and Sergey Utev, *A new maximal inequality and invariance principle for stationary sequences*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), no. 2, 798–815. MR 2123210 (2005m:60047) 1, 8, 9

[PUW07] Magda Peligrad, Sergey Utev, and Wei Biao Wu, *A maximal $\mathbb{L}_p$-inequality for stationary sequences and its applications*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (2007), no. 2, 541–550 (electronic). MR 2255301 (2007m:60047) 2, 3, 5, 9

[RS03] Alfredas Račkauskas and Charles Suquet, *Necessary and sufficient condition for the Lamperti invariance principle*, Teor. Ĭmovīr. Mat. Stat. (2003), no. 68, 115–124. MR 2000642 (2004g:60050) 2

[Suq99] Ch. Suquet, *Tightness in Schauder decomposable Banach spaces*, Proceedings of the St. Petersburg Mathematical Society, Vol. V (Providence, RI), Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 193, Amer. Math. Soc., 1999, pp. 201–224. MR 1736910 (2000k:60009) 4

[Vol06] Dalibor Volný, *Martingale approximation of non adapted stochastic processes with nonlinear growth of variance*, Dependence in probability and statistics, Lecture Notes in Statist., vol. 187, Springer, New York, 2006, pp. 141–156. MR 2283254 (2008b:60070) 1

[Vol07] ———, *A nonadapted version of the invariance principle of Peligrad and Utev*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **345** (2007), no. 3, 167–169. MR 2344817 (2008k:60078) 1, 9

[Vol10] ———, *Martingale approximation and optimality of some conditions for the central limit theorem*, J. Theoret. Probab. **23** (2010), no. 3, 888–903. MR 2679961 (2011k:60122) 1

Normandie Université, Université de Rouen, Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, CNRS, UMR 6085, Avenue de l'université, BP 12, 76801 Saint-Etienne du Rouvray Cedex, France.

E-mail address: davide.giraudo1@univ-rouen.fr